



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III. — *On the Authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian.*

BY JOSIAH BRIDGE, PH.D.,

NEW YORK, N.Y.

NEAR the end of our editions of Lucian is found a short dialogue between Lycinus and a Cynic in which the Cynic successfully defends the life of his school against the charges of Lycinus (*Cynicus*). There is a famous dialogue of Lucian's, the *Fugitivi*, whose main theme is an attack on the Cynics of Lucian's day. Fr. Fritzsche in his edition of Lucian (II. 2, p. 235 sq.) maintains that these two dialogues, so utterly at variance in their aims, could not have been written by the same author. Lucian wrote the *Fugitivi*; therefore Lucian did not write the *Cynicus*.

The aim of this paper is to show, first, that Fritzsche's inference that Lucian could not have written the *Cynicus* is incorrect; secondly, that Lucian did write the *Cynicus*.

To establish the first point it will only be necessary to call attention to Lucian's attitude towards Cynics and Cynicism. Bernays, in his well-known book on Lucian and the Cynics, holds that Lucian was entirely incapable of appreciating the Cynic life. He admits that in the Dialogues of the Dead Lucian shows some toleration of the older Cynics; but claims that the other Cynic dialogues from the *Vitarum Auctio* to the *Fugitivi* show evidence of a steadily growing hatred of the whole sect. In answer to this Vahlen (Index Lectionum, Berlin, 1882-3) has shown that the attitude of Lucian towards the old and true Cynics is throughout friendly, while to false Cynics of his own day he is the same bitter enemy that he is to the false philosophers of all schools. But I would go still farther than Vahlen, and maintain that to Lucian the highest type of philosophy was true Cynicism. Not merely do his life of Demonax, and his praise of Menippus and Diogenes throughout his works show this, but still more does a com-

parison between the seventh chapter of the *Trajectus* and the fifth of the *Fugitivi*. It is not denied that Cyniscus in the *Trajectus* represents the true Cynic philosopher. In the chapter mentioned Cyniscus asks Clotho through what fault of his he had been kept so long alive, and Clotho answers that she had left him designedly that he might be ἔφορος καὶ ἰατρὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀμαρτημάτων. In the *Fugitivi* is told how Zeus saw the world filled with crime and lawlessness and sent down Philosophy to be the physician of men's sins. That is, Zeus sent Philosophy down for precisely the same reason that Fate kept Cyniscus in life. There seems no reason for denying the conclusion that this ideal Cynic was to Lucian the ideal philosopher.

Fritzsche has tacitly assumed that to attack Cynics is to attack Cynicism. This can hardly be true. Unquestionably in the *Fugitivi* Lucian attacks most bitterly the mass of Cynics of his day, but he is careful to show that to him the mass of Cynics are false Cynics. It is noteworthy that in this very dialogue the philosophers who induced Philosophy when sorely grieved at the fate of her true votaries to remain on earth are all Cynics,—Antisthenes, Diogenes, Crates, and Menippus. These are old-time Cynics, it is true, but even in his bitterest attack Lucian, intentionally or not, suggests that there are true Cynics of his own day. Philosophy (c. 14) is speaking of the artisans that flock straight from the shops to her standard; each wrapped in his single cloak, with wallet on his back and staff in his hand (that is, in the Cynic garb), sees that to all intents he shall be on equal footing with the true philosophers, and that no one will distinguish them, if only their outsides be alike: that is, there are true Cynics of his own time whom these false ones can bring into disrepute. Such a true Cynic was Demonax. It is then not impossible that this author of the *Fugitivi* should have spoken in favor of true Cynics and of Cynicism.

Granting then that as far as its argument goes, Lucian might have written the *Cynicus*, what testimony about the authorship of the dialogue has its language to offer? At the very outset the Cynic is said κόμην ἔχειν. This was a great stum-

bling-block to Du Soul, who said¹ that the best writers in speaking of Cynics' hair always called them *ἐν χρῶ κεκαρμένοι*, "just as beyond question Cynics were"; but in our dialogue the Cynic is repeatedly (cc. 13, 16, 20) spoken of as having his hair long. All that remains, adds Du Soul, is to remind you that the work is spurious, and not worth further thought. Strangely enough, editors of Lucian since Du Soul's time have been content with repeating his note, or at least have added no word against it. Even Fritzsche has been led astray (ed. I. 2, p. 79, II. 2, 257). For there can be no doubt that in Lucian's time and earlier it was the custom of Cynics to wear their hair long. Tatian, the contemporary of Lucian (*Ad Graecos*, c. 25), describes philosophers who go about in long hair and full beards, with one cloak, with wallet and with staff, emulating dogs. We do not require the scholiast here to tell us that Cynics are meant. More interesting is the testimony of Dio Chrysostom, who paints the Cynic (ed. Dind. Vol. II., p. 245, l. 22) with but one cloak, with long hair on head and chin. This will do for testimony outside of Lucian, but this author himself in his account of Peregrinus' death (c. 15), says that Peregrinus, even before he had left the Christians, had adopted the Cynic garb: *ἐκόμα δὲ ἤδη καὶ τρίβωνα πιναρὸν ἡμπεύχματο καὶ πῆραν παρήρητητο καὶ τὸ ζύλον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ἦν*. To support his note before cited Du Soul is compelled to consider the words *ἐκόμα δὲ ἤδη* corrupt, without cause, however, if, as is now plain, the Cynics of Lucian's day wore long hair. Grant this, and no one will deny that every word in the above description refers to the Cynic garb.

What, then, did Du Soul mean by saying that beyond all question Cynics were clipped to the skin? In his *Fugitivi* (c. 25) Lucian speaks of a Cynic, Cantharus, as having *ἐν χρῶ κουρίαν*. This passage Du Soul had in mind. But as this is the only passage of the sort yet found, it probably should receive a different interpretation from the one hitherto given it. Unquestionably it was the custom of the *Stoics* in Lucian's time to cut their hair close, — as Lucian states in the *Hermotimus* (c. 18), — and in the *Bis Accusatus* (c. 20) the Porch says of her-

¹ Edit. Lehm. IX., pp. 473-4.

self ἐν χρῶ κέκαρμαι. Cantharus then seems to have assumed a partly Stoic, partly Cynic dress, — nor can this seem strange if we recall what Hercules at the end of the dialogue says of him, “He said he was a Cynic down in Greece, but here in Thrace he is Chrysippus’ man out and out, and soon you’ll see him a Cleanthes, for the fellow shall hang from his beard” (c. 31, end). Cantharus, then, in the former passage is pictured as he was when captured in Thrace, a ridiculous mixture of the neat and trim Stoic and the frowzy Cynic. At all events, Fritzsche is wrong in stating (ed. II. 2, p. 257) that in Thrace Cantharus had discarded the Cynic habit by growing his hair and cutting off his beard: in that case how could Hercules say κρεμήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πώγωνος?

Therefore against Du Soul’s argument we may now say, in *no* place in any author before or during Lucian’s time is short hair mentioned as a characteristic of the Cynic’s costume; but in several places, as in the *Cynicus*, Cynics are called long-haired.

But there are other difficulties in the way of the belief that Lucian wrote the *Cynicus*. In this book alone of all those under his name which speak expressly of the Cynic dress there is nowhere a mention either of the wallet or of the staff; though in Lucian we recognize a Cynic more by his staff and wallet than by his hair. But by far the greatest difficulty is in the style of the *Cynicus*. The most careless reader is struck by the frequency of repetition of the first word in a clause, a peculiarity of diction utterly at variance with Lucian’s style. Thus, in c. 5, the gods’ gifts are so plentiful ὥς ἔχειν μὲν ἡμᾶς σιτία παντοδαπά, ἔχειν δὲ ποτὸν ἡδύ, ἔχειν δὲ χρήματα, ἔχειν δὲ εὐνὴν μαλακὴν, ἔχειν δὲ οἰκίαν καλάν, or in c. 8, σκόπει γὰρ τὸν πολύευκτον χρυσόν, σκόπει τὸν ἄργυρον, σκόπει τὰς ἐσθῆτας τὰς ἐσπουδασμένας, σκόπει τὰ τούτοις ἀκόλουθα πάντα πόσων πραγμάτων ἐστὶν ὧνια, πόσων πόνων, πόσων κινδύνων μᾶλλον δὲ αἵματος καὶ θανάτου καὶ διαφθορᾶς ἀνθρώπων πόσης. Similar is the repetition of σχῆμα καὶ στολή in c. 16. The frequent use of ποικίλος καὶ παντοδαπός is also surprising for Lucian, although this phrase is found once in the *Nigrinus* (c. 36).

The question, then, reduces itself to this: Shall we, on account of these peculiarities of language, declare the *Cynicus* spurious, or is Lucian imitating some one both in style and argument?¹ Such imitation certainly is found in other places in Lucian, as in the ranting of the quack philosopher Thrasyclus at the end of the *Timon*, and in the book and conversation of *Lexiphanes*. Yet if Lucian is imitating some one, who is the man? We might with Richard assume it to be some Cynic famous for the day whose name is lost. But the resemblance of our Cynic to a greater man is striking enough to demand consideration. Dio Chrysostom, who, as he himself tells us,² had adopted the Cynic's costume, devotes his 72d Oration to the discussion of this dress. Dio thinks it strange that all who assume that garb are handled so contemptuously by the masses, especially when in their temples they see the statues of Zeus and Poseidon and many other gods in just such a dress, although among some of the barbarians the style of dressing the gods is different. This is precisely the argument of the last section of the *Cynicus*, so that one on reading the two works can readily believe that the author of the *Cynicus* had the passage of Dio in mind. But Dio does not merely forestall the Cynic in his defence; he also adopts a similar line of attack, although at the end of his oration he adds what the Cynic nowhere asserts, that merely the dress of Diogenes cannot make Diogenes himself.

I believe that Lucian wrote the *Cynicus* with the same design with which he wrote the *Piscator*. In the latter book he wished not to recant but to explain what he had said in the *Vitarum Auctio*. In the *Cynicus* his chief intent was to show that what he had hitherto been attacking in the Cynics was not their dress nor their life of self-denial. Such a life he has elsewhere praised in the first chapter of the *Demonax*. Probably Lucian thought this explanation due to such a man as Dio Chrysostom, who not only had adopted the dress of the Cynics, but like *Demonax*, before all others revered Socrates

¹ Cf. Richard, *Ueber die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian*, Hamburg, 1886, pp. 33 sqq.

² Cf. Ed. Dind. II., p. 246, l. 3, and p. 250, l. 23, w. II., p. 22, l. 22 sq.

(*Or.* 60) and admired Diogenes (*Orr.* 4, 6, 8, 9, 10), who with the Cynics thought Philosophy nothing else than τὸ ζητεῖν καὶ φιλοτιμείσθαι ὅπως τις ἔσται καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός (*Or.* 13, Dind. I. 249, 14), who, like a Cynic, praises the αὐτάρκεια of Diogenes (*Or.* 6), though while he strongly favored true Cynicism, his verdict on the mass of Cynics of his day was the same as Lucian's (Ed. Dind. I. 402, 28). Above all, the style of Dio resembles our *Cynicus*. In his third oration he says (Dind. I. 51, 12) ψυχὴ δὲ . . . πολλὰ πάσχει, ῥυομένη μὲν ἐκ νόσων τὸ σῶμα, ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ πολέμων, ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ χειμῶνος ῥυομένη δ' ἐκ θαλάττης, and in this same oration there are twenty-four instances of similar repetition. The use of ποικίλος καὶ παντοδαπός is frequent enough to be of itself noticeable, and we find in the first oration a use of σχῆμα καὶ στολή similar to the use in the *Cynicus* (I. 11, 18). It must be admitted that Dio nowhere calls himself a Cynic; but he nowhere calls himself a philosopher of any school. It might be noted here that the word "Cynic" nowhere occurs in the text of the *Cynicus*. The fact, too, that in the *Cynicus* there is no mention of wallet or staff agrees so well with Dio's description of his own dress as to account for the omission. Besides, under Dio's mask Lucian could best preach against the vices of his own times; for, as Philostratus says (*Vit. Soph.* I. 7), most excellent in Dio's orations is ἡ τοῦ ἥθους κρᾶσις. And this attack is the secondary aim of the *Cynicus* (cf. Wieland, III. 147 sq.). Nor is it strange that in this as in his other dialogues the author shows a laughing face from his mask. For "ridentem dicere verum | Quid vetat?" Certainly to raise a laugh was not his only motive.

Lucian expressly mentions Dio only twice, first in *Peregrinus* (c. 18), where he is said to have won much fame from his exile. The second passage is the second chapter of the *Parasitus*, where the Parasite says, if you should call him by the title Parasite you would gratify him as much as you would Dio by dubbing him Philosopher. It is disputed what Dio is here meant, the more common view being that of Wieland and Lehmann, who think him some insignificant contemporary aspirant to the title. But Lucian's words fit so well

Dio Chrysostom's own statement about himself that there is good ground for believing Chrysostom is meant. In his 13th Oration Dio tells how, when he wandered from land to land in his Cynic dress, some called him vagabond, others beggar, others still philosopher. Most of the so-called philosophers assume that title themselves, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων λεγόντων οὐκ ἐδυνάμην ἀεὶ καὶ πᾶσι διαμάχεσθαι (Dind. I. 243, 28). This coy method of consenting to the title is very much that of a man who, above all things, would be gratified at hearing it from another's lips.

That Lucian and his hearers should be so intimately acquainted with Dio's writings as the Cynic's parody supposes is not at all surprising, when we remember that Dio was not only a philosopher; he was by far the most illustrious rhetorician of his time, as is proved by his name, Chrysostom, and by the eulogy of Lucian's contemporary Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* I. 7), who compares him with Demosthenes and Plato. And there could be no doubt that he was at that time a model to all aspirants to rhetorical fame, even if we had not the express testimony of Philostratus that this was true in the case of Aelian (*Vit. Soph.* II. 31, 1), and of Hipodromus (II. 27, 10).

If, on the other hand, we decide that the work is spurious, we can hardly suppose that it was the writer's object to pass off the book as one of Lucian's. For the variations from Lucian's style are too much on the surface, nor is it probable that any imitator would be guilty of so many un-Lucianic repetitions. But if the writer's object were, as Bernays supposes, to defend the same Cynics that Lucian attacks, among so many mentions of the Cynic costume should we not expect to find what Lucian especially notes, — the wallet and staff with the single cloak, rather than the habit that Dio wore? The fact that the name of the Cynic's opponent is Lycinus compels us, if we conclude that the dialogue is spurious, to adopt one of these two views. As it is, the book is found in the manuscripts of Lucian, which of itself is ground enough for holding it Lucian's unless very weighty reasons oppose. To me such reasons do not exist.